

1 U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2 INFORMATION SESSION/PUBLIC HEARING

3 _____

4 IN THE MATTER OF:

5 SUBJECT: Proposed Clean-Up Plan for
6 Lammars Barrel Factory Site.

7 _____

8
9 Hearing held before Hearing Officer
10 Bri Bill, held on Thursday, April 22, 1999, at
11 7:00 p.m., at the Beavercreek City Hall,
12 Council Chambers, 1368 Research Parkway,
13 Beavercreek, Ohio.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 MS. BILL: Good evening. Can
2 everybody hear me? The purpose of tonight's
3 meeting is to present a proposed, and hopefully
4 final, clean-up plan for the Lammars Barrel
5 Site. We're also here to solicit, formally,
6 your comments on the proposed plan.

7 My name is Bri Bill and I'm a
8 community involvement coordinator with the
9 United States Environmental Protection Agency
10 out of Chicago and I'll be the moderator
11 tonight.

12 With me, behind me is Heather
13 Nelson, the remedial project manager, and over
14 to my right is Amy Gibbons Bohler who's
15 Heather's counterpart at Ohio EPA.

16 I'd also like to recognize a
17 couple of other people in the audience, Edward
18 Hess from the Beavercreek Environmental
19 Advisory Committee, Dan Dubruiel, who's the
20 City Administrator, Mayor Glaser sitting next
21 to him. Don Kessler from the community
22 advisory group, and that community advisory
23 group was formed about a year ago and has been
24 helping EPA and giving some recommendations on
25 our clean-up. And finally Bob Fry from the

1 Ohio Department of Health. In the very back,
2 Karen Bryant, also a member of the Ohio EPA.

3 We have a court reporter here
4 tonight, Kimberly Davis. If you do have a
5 question or want to make a comment later in the
6 meeting, I'd ask that you spell your last name
7 and first name if it's unusual.

8 Just a couple of logistics, on
9 the back table we have a copy of the proposed
10 plan. Many of you may have received it in the
11 mail, it outlines the alternatives that we
12 looked at for clean-up as well as the one that
13 we're proposing tonight. Could I just see a
14 quick show of hands of people who have been to
15 one of our meetings before in the Lammars
16 Barrel.

17 (WHEREUPON, there was a showing
18 of hands.)

19 MS. BILL: I think that's a
20 hundred percent. Okay, so most of you will
21 have heard what we're going to say tonight so
22 we're going to be summarizing because of that.
23 But there's a couple of changes, things that
24 you haven't heard. One is that we have changed
25 one of our recommended clean-up alternatives

1 from a point of entry filter to hooking up
2 several homes to county water.

3 Another difference between
4 tonight's meeting and other meetings in the
5 past is we are, this is more of a formal
6 meeting and we are formally taking your
7 comments. We will also be answering questions
8 but I'll get to that in just a minute.

9 I think you all have a copy of
10 the agenda, basically we'll talk a little bit
11 about the site history and background, we'll
12 talk a little bit about some of the
13 investigations that have occurred in the past,
14 and we're going to invite Ed Hess to speak a
15 little bit about some recent sampling that was
16 conducted not by any of the Federal or State
17 agencies but with funding from the City and
18 assistance from the Committee, the Greene
19 County Combined Health Department and the
20 Community Advisory Group. They did some
21 sampling.

22 We'll talk about the
23 alternatives that we've looked at in the past,
24 get into the proposed alternatives that we hope
25 will be acceptable, and then talk a little bit

1 about schedule.

2 And finally we'll open the floor
3 up to questions and answers, and at that time
4 we'll do our best to answer your questions
5 here. When we're through with that, I'd like
6 to open the floor up to a formal comment
7 period. And what we do with that is we ask you
8 to make a comment, if you'd like to.

9 We won't be responding to that
10 comment tonight but we will be responding to
11 that comment at a later date in writing in a
12 document called a Responsiveness Summary, and
13 that will be part of the public record. So if
14 you want something to be on the public record,
15 that would be the time to make your comment.

16 Okay. I don't have anything
17 else to say. I'd like to introduce Heather
18 Nelson then, or, no, Amy Gibbons Bohler to
19 start out with. Thanks.

20 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: I'll try to
21 be brief because I know all of you have heard
22 this many times before. I'm going to be doing
23 the site history and some background about the
24 facility and its operations.

25 Up here you can see we have a

1 map which I think you're all becoming familiar
2 with. It's the Lammars Barrel Factory Site at
3 East Patterson and Grange Hall Roads and the
4 Little Beaver Creek runs through the middle of
5 that and there is light industrial,
6 agricultural, residential, and other commercial
7 businesses around there.

8 The site itself, when it was
9 operating, bought, sold and reclaimed flammable
10 insolvent chemicals from 1953 to 1969. There
11 was, during site operations, more than 500,000
12 gallons of storage capacity on the site and
13 this consisted of 18 vertical storage tanks and
14 6,000, about 6,000 fifty-five gallon drums.

15 This information came from
16 information given to the fire department at the
17 time of the fire and from employees' and site
18 owners' recollections about what was at the
19 site. And, as you all know, a fire destroyed
20 the facility in 1969.

21 In 1985 several area residents
22 and the Ohio EPA conducted some residential
23 well sampling and identified an area of
24 groundwater contamination in the area of the
25 Lammars Barrel Factory.

1 Due to the very high levels of
2 vinyl chloride at the time, Ohio EPA requested
3 that U.S. EPA come in and offer assistance.
4 Vinyl chloride is a volatile organic compound
5 and these are compounds that evaporate easily.

6 Also in 1985, U.S. EPA conducted
7 an emergency removal, and this consisted of
8 extending county water lines mostly along East
9 Patterson and developing an EPA plan to conduct
10 a non-sampling site investigation.

11 These non-sampling site
12 investigations don't involve any sampling at
13 the site but just a review of the known data.
14 Based on this non-sampling site investigation,
15 U.S. EPA developed and implemented a complete
16 sampling program, implemented a community
17 relations plan, and initiated a comprehensive
18 hydrogeological investigation.

19 In 1988 and 1991, Ohio EPA
20 conducted additional groundwater sampling to
21 continue monitoring the flume. In 1992, we
22 did, Ohio EPA did a sampling site inspection
23 for U.S. EPA.

24 Based on the sample results from
25 that inspection we sampled soil groundwater

1 sediments. The site was recommended for
2 further study and possible clean-up. This
3 recommendation led to the EECA process in
4 1996.

5 Now, what is an EECA? EECA is
6 an acronym that stands for Engineering
7 Evaluation and Cost Analysis. Basically what
8 gets done is we fill in any data gaps for
9 identifying the nature and extent of the
10 contamination, we evaluate the risks to human
11 health and the environment, and then we look at
12 a selection of clean-up alternatives for
13 removing these risks and adjusting the
14 contamination.

15 The EECA is conducted under U.S.
16 EPA's Superfund authority. And now I believe
17 Heather Nelson is going to discuss the EECA
18 sampling and the results of that.

19 MS. NELSON: Good evening.
20 Again my name is Heather Nelson. As part of
21 the EECA we conducted support sampling, that
22 included soil sampling, sediments along the
23 Little Beaver Creek on-site groundwater, and
24 then also groundwater from the residential
25 wells.

1 This figure was the result of
2 the sampling. Right here is an area of
3 contamination. What we found was that the
4 highest levels were between 8 and 9 feet deep.
5 Then also this area in here (indicating).

6 We also conducted residential
7 groundwater well sampling. Residential
8 groundwater wells were sampled in March, June,
9 and August of 1997. 54 residential groundwater
10 well samples were collected and the samples
11 were analyzed for volatile organic compounds,
12 PCBs and lead.

13 From the sampling results we
14 were able to identify 3 homes here that had TCE
15 above the federal drinking water standards.
16 Also we were able to find that vinyl chloride
17 still existed in these homes along East
18 Patterson Road. And I will mention that the
19 homes with the vinyl chloride contamination
20 have been already connected to county water.

21 As part of the EECA process we
22 do do a risk assessment. It's the most, I
23 would say the most important part of the EECA
24 process, it allows us to find out where the
25 risk is to people, plants and animals. It also

1 allows us to put a number on the cancer and
2 non-cancer effects either current or future.

3 U.S. EPA's policy sets an
4 acceptable risk range for cancer, a 1 chance in
5 10,000 to 1 chance in a million. This is over
6 a 70 year lifetime. This means that for every
7 10,000 people in an affected area, an extra
8 cancer case may occur as a result of exposure
9 to the contaminants. This is considered
10 acceptable. Any more than 1 in 10,000 is
11 unacceptable.

12 For non-cancer risk, such as
13 organ damage, immunological effects, skin
14 irritation, and the like, U.S. EPA defines
15 acceptable exposure as those levels, the levels
16 of exposure which would have no adverse effects
17 on population. That is denoted as a hazard
18 index of 1. Anything above 1 is unacceptable.

19 With respect to Lammars' site
20 risk assessment, we evaluated the current and
21 future risks to the population. We looked at 3
22 possible ways that people could come in contact
23 with the contamination.

24 One of those ways was teenagers
25 coming into contact with the site soils or the

1 stream sediments. We also looked at adults
2 being on site, digging around in the dirt, and
3 then also residents either drinking or bathing
4 in the groundwater.

5 From the EECA we were able to
6 come up with a risk table and that puts a
7 number on the amount of risk to the 3 exposure
8 pathways. As you can see, teenagers certainly
9 fell within the acceptable risk range as well
10 as adult site visitors.

11 When we looked at residential
12 use of groundwater, vinyl chloride gave us a
13 risk number of 9.2 in 1,000, obviously
14 unacceptable. I would also add that the homes
15 that we did find vinyl chloride at have all
16 been connected to county water.

17 We also looked at TCE,
18 Trichloroethene, these are the 3 homes that are
19 not on county water, and we came up with a
20 hazard, a non -- yes, a hazard index of .944
21 which is very close to 1.

22 We did look at exposure pathways
23 for future conditions; one of those would be
24 site workers either digging in the soils, and
25 also site workers using the drinking water,

1 using the groundwater for drinking.

2 We were, for the future site
3 workers, soil exposure, there was no risk.
4 With the future site workers using groundwater
5 for drinking, there was a risk. That was
6 unacceptable.

7 And now we'll hear from Edward
8 Hess from the Beavercreek Environmental
9 Advisory Committee to talk about the additional
10 residential well sampling.

11 MR. HESS: First of all, I'd
12 just like you to listen to who we are. We're
13 12 members, we're all residents of the
14 community and were appointed by the City
15 Council to serve as advisors to the City
16 Council. The majority of us are environmental
17 engineers, we work in the environmental areas
18 as a full-time job.

19 Council has us either respond to
20 questions that they may have or to raise issues
21 to them that we feel important in the
22 environmental area, in the Beavercreek area.

23 In doing that, we do monitor
24 certain situations in the area, one is
25 groundwater protection, well head protection,

1 domestic and commercial underground storage
2 tanks, environmental impacts of development in
3 the area and restoration sites, which Lammars
4 would be one.

5 When we were working on this,
6 the City Manager, Dan Dubruiel, asked us if we
7 would serve the CAG as technical advisors for
8 their efforts here, and we agreed and have been
9 working with them for awhile.

10 When we reviewed the EECA we had
11 a few concerns on it, one was that the EPA had
12 not adequately identified the contaminant
13 flume. The problems we saw were they're
14 relying primarily on domestic wells of unknown
15 structure, well logs were incomplete or
16 missing, and that the actual sampling had not
17 gone out far enough, that it was possible for
18 the parts of the flume to have escaped the
19 sampling area.

20 So with the support of the City
21 Manager and City Council and the Ohio
22 Department of Environmental Health, Greene
23 County, I'm sorry, Greene County Department of
24 Environmental Health, we took, underwent a
25 sampling plan.

1 It was supposed to be in two
2 stages. We went through the first stage and
3 sampled the areas shown here in the green. Not
4 shown on here is another site down on Colborne
5 and on Patterson Road which is Eastgate Ford
6 (indicating).

7 Of these, the only site that
8 showed any kind of contamination was one at
9 1160 Stanwick which also had previously shown
10 contamination on sites. Level of contamination
11 was 7/10ths of a part per billion. When we saw
12 that number, we were very uncertain as to what
13 we were looking at because of the very low
14 value.

15 To put it in perspective,
16 7/10ths of a part per billion is if you take
17 the distance from us to the moon, that's about
18 8 inches we're talking about. So with that low
19 sample we were uncertain if that was laboratory
20 contamination or not so we resampled it and it
21 came back as 7/10ths of a part per billion.
22 We're fairly certain that that is a true
23 value.

24 What this tells us really is
25 that the flume is a very static flume, it is

1 not really showing any tendency to migrate at
2 all. There's a number of reasons that this can
3 be such; one is that the soils in the area are
4 very tightly binding the solvents not allowing
5 them to move on. Another is that over the
6 years that the bacterial cultures of the soils
7 have become facultative and have been able to
8 degrade the contaminants.

9 What this would show for a long
10 term kind of prognosis is that in the second
11 case, once they remove the source up here, then
12 we'd start seeing lessening of the plume as it
13 degrades. Were there any questions on this
14 (indicating)?

15 MR. KESSLER: My name is Don
16 Kessler. I think we talked about this before
17 but I'm not quite clear. Some of these that
18 you sampled that had contaminants before, are
19 they now without contamination, is that
20 correct?

21 MR. HESS: No, we really didn't
22 resample any that had shown contamination. We
23 are trying to put our, our effort was to try to
24 delineate the plume, not determine if there was
25 any changes in the existing plume.

1 MR. KESSLER: Okay. The reason
2 I ask is that at the end of the one cul-de-sac
3 there --

4 MR. HESS: Right here
5 (indicating)?

6 MR. KESSLER: Right there. Was
7 there contamination there before?

8 MR. HESS: No, that was
9 indicated as non-sampled. This was the first
10 time we sampled that.

11 MR. KESSLER: Okay, thanks.

12 MR. LETT: Did you say you did
13 not check any on Colborne Drive?

14 MR. HESS: No, there are two,
15 there was one site down on Colborne Drive which
16 doesn't, isn't on this chart, probably about
17 down in this area. And what we are looking for
18 is the possibility that a section of the flume
19 may have escaped the area that they had
20 concentrated their sampling at, which is why
21 they're looking at the further out areas.
22 There was no indication of any VOCs at that
23 area.

24 MS. BILL: Sure, would you mind
25 stating your name for the record?

1 MR. LETT: Sherman Lett. I live
2 at 3818 Colborne.

3 MS. NELSON: As part of the EECA
4 we do look at clean-up alternatives and
5 evaluate them based on their effectiveness,
6 their cost, and their implementability.

7 For these on-site contamination,
8 that would mean the soils, we took a look at no
9 action, which is what it is, no action. We
10 retain no action as a baseline comparison for
11 the other alternatives.

12 We also looked at soil vapor
13 extraction. Soil vapor extraction is an
14 in-ground method for treating the volatile
15 organic compounds by using a vacuum pump to
16 remove the contamination.

17 We also looked at low
18 temperature thermal desorption. This involves
19 removing the contaminated soils which are then
20 heated to burn off the contamination.

21 We took a look at dual phase
22 extraction which uses a pump to extract both
23 liquids and gases from the contaminated area.
24 Both are treated and then discharged.

25 Finally, we took a look at air

1 sparging, which essentially injects air into
2 the soils and then those contaminants are
3 changed to a vapor and we're able to collect
4 them. And generally you'll use that with soil
5 vapor extraction.

6 We took a look at some
7 residential well alternatives as well; again,
8 no action, we retained that as a baseline
9 comparison, county water line extension for the
10 3 homes that have TCE above the federal
11 drinking water standards, point of entry carbon
12 filters, this is, the filtration is installed
13 and it reduces the contamination into the
14 home.

15 And finally we took a look at
16 pump and treat, which essentially you pump the
17 water out, treat it and then it's discharged.

18 From those alternatives we were
19 able to select the clean-up alternatives that
20 would address both the on-site contamination
21 and the residential well contamination.

22 The source remediation as noted
23 is the dual phase extraction, and the
24 residential well contamination is noted as the
25 county water line extension.

1 Our objective with the dual
2 phase extraction was to take care of a
3 contaminated area and prevent further
4 contamination.

5 Dual phase extraction, as I
6 mentioned, takes liquid and vapors and they're
7 extracted from the soil by a powerful vacuum
8 pump. This extracted air and water is then
9 treated to remove the contaminants and then
10 it's treated after that point and discharged.

11 Through this technology we're
12 able to reduce the contaminant spread and our
13 technology is enhanced. This is just a basic
14 diagram of a single pump dual phrase extraction
15 system.

16 Here's your pump, this would be
17 your contaminant area. It flows through a
18 water treatment system, an air treatment
19 system. Here's you water discharge point and
20 then your treated air discharge point
21 (indicating).

22 Again we took a look at county
23 water line extensions. There's two possible
24 routes, one is from East Patterson, south along
25 Ridgefield Center to Rockfield Drive and east

1 on Rockfield to Rosendale Drive, then north on
2 Rosendale to the 3 affected homes. That puts
3 us essentially down here, around, and then in
4 here (indicating).

5 Our second route would be
6 through an alley on the east side of the Eagles
7 Lodge and the strip mall on Ridgefield Center
8 to reach Rosendale, essentially cutting across
9 several backyards.

10 Again we take a look at the cost
11 of the remedies. The estimated cost of the
12 dual phase extraction system is \$950,000. The
13 estimated cost of the county water line
14 extension based on route 1 is \$190,000, for
15 route 2 is \$90,500. Again that would require
16 an easement and then traversing several
17 backyards here (indicating).

18 The next steps include the
19 public comment period which will end on May
20 12th, opportunity for you to get your written
21 comments in to us. From that point the
22 enforcement action memorandum is prepared, it
23 takes generally two months to put it together
24 and get it through sign-off, have it reviewed.

25 In addition to the enforcement

1 action memorandum we do the responsiveness
2 summary which is formal responses to the
3 comments that you make to us. It takes
4 generally a month to put that together.

5 After those two components are
6 put together, the enforcement action
7 memorandum, which is the formal decision
8 document, it's signed by the director of the
9 Superfund division and then we're able to start
10 our clean-up design. We're hoping to start the
11 clean-up design in September of this year,
12 again it's going to depend on our funding.

13 And now I'm going to turn it
14 over to Bri Bill for the question and answer
15 session.

16 MS. BILL: Okay, I'd like to
17 open up the floor to questions. Let me bring
18 the mike over, and again just a reminder to
19 state your name for the record.

20 MR. GLASER: My name is Bob
21 Glaser. My question is last year at this time
22 you indicated that funding was not available
23 this year; do you expect funding to be
24 available this year?

25 MS. NELSON: Our anticipation is

1 that we'll have regional money to fund this
2 this year.

3 MS. BILL: Next question?

4 MR. MOORE: Elmer Moore,
5 Rosendale, are you going to put water in or
6 not?

7 MS. NELSON: As part of the EECA
8 process we did evaluate the alternatives, we
9 selected county water lines in addition to the
10 source remediation along with the community
11 advisory group and we both agreed that county
12 water would be extended to those 3 homes.

13 MR. MOORE: If I understand
14 right, you said you, a possibility of going
15 through the yards or through the alley or down
16 around Ridgefield, which is your main routes?

17 MS. NELSON: Really it's going
18 to boil down to a design issue. Obviously it's
19 going to cost us more to loop it around.
20 There's not really a preference right now.

21 MR. MOORE: So you don't know,
22 you don't know yet for sure which way you're
23 going?

24 MS. NELSON: No.

25 MR. MOORE: But there is going

1 to be water brought in?

2 MS. NELSON: Yes.

3 MR. MOORE: Thank you.

4 MS. BILL: And the issue, is it
5 not, Heather, that we would need to get
6 easements to go through the shorter route?

7 MS. NELSON: Yes. In order to
8 traverse the alley we would have to get an
9 easement.

10 MR. MOORE: Who do you get those
11 easements from?

12 MS. NELSON: Property owner.

13 MR. MOORE: You're still not
14 going to be cutting through anybody's yards
15 though?

16 MS. NELSON: If we go this route
17 here, we won't have to.

18 MS. BILL: Okay. Next question?

19 MR. KESSLER: Donald Kessler.
20 Question, assuming all of the processes go
21 through normally and there's funding available,
22 how soon could they break ground and when do
23 you anticipate, you know, the actual
24 commencement of the clean-up and conclusion?

25 MS. NELSON: Generally we give a

1 design process about a year. Because this site
2 is small and it's not going to take a lot to
3 get something put in place here, my
4 anticipation would be 6 months down the line
5 from September, we should be able to break
6 ground.

7 MS. BILL: Other questions?

8 MR. PETRAK: Jerry Petrak. The
9 question is, you're going to do both
10 remediation of the source and put in water
11 lines, why do you need the water lines if
12 you're going to fix the source and clean up the
13 aquifer?

14 MS. NELSON: Well, we did take a
15 look at other alternatives and it was our
16 impression from the community advisory group
17 that county water was the strongest
18 recommendation.

19 MS. BILL: I wanted to add
20 something too, that the dual phase vapor
21 extraction is not intended to clean up the
22 entire aquifer but to clean up the contaminated
23 soil and water that's on the property itself.

24 The aquifer is contaminated
25 beyond the boundaries of the site and that's

1 what the county water line extension is
2 intended to address is to just get those homes
3 above federal standards having clean water, but
4 the dual phase extraction is not going clean
5 up --

6 MR. PETRAK: It won't affect the
7 aquifer, that's only the ground itself?

8 MS. BILL: It will affect the
9 soils and the water that are in the, at the
10 Lammars Barrel property but not beyond, is that
11 right, Heather?

12 MS. NELSON: It will address --

13 MS. BILL: The source
14 remediation?

15 MS. NELSON: Yes.

16 MR. KESSLER: I just want to
17 make a comment, the reason the CAG is adamant
18 on having the water lines extended is there's 3
19 houses that are fairly severely affected by the
20 contamination and once they clean the site up,
21 it will be a number of years, and we're not
22 sure when the water will actually be down to a
23 safe level.

24 In the meantime, I know one of
25 the homeowners goes through considerable

1 personal expense to maintain filters in his
2 house and we're trying to remedy the situation
3 and it's not quite right, so if possible we
4 would like to get the water lines extended.

5 MS. BILL: Other questions?

6 MR. DALLEY: Wondered if you or
7 someone on the panel there might comment on the
8 reports that there was a basement or partial
9 basement that may have had storage down there
10 under the site because if there was, if there
11 is still a reservoir of the solvents that are
12 continually leaking in that might affect your
13 decision in a major way.

14 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Yeah,
15 again, I'm Amy Gibbons Bohler with the Ohio EPA
16 and I was involved with the site a couple of
17 years ago when we did the site, the EECA
18 sampling, and based on a comment that we got at
19 one of these public meetings that there was a
20 basement room, we did, we used a technology
21 where you can send ultrasound through the
22 ground and we did identify the walls of a
23 basement room, but the only thing that appeared
24 to be in it was fill material.

25 I was out there at the site and

1 they showed us the pictures at the time and
2 they said, oh, here's rebar from the wall
3 structures but there was nothing other than
4 dirt and fill material in the basement room.
5 So we did look into that and we appreciate the
6 information.

7 MS. BILL: Would you state your
8 name for the record?

9 MR. DALLEY: Yeah, sorry -- no,
10 that's not my name. James L. Dalley,
11 D-A-L-L-E-Y.

12 MS. BILL: You had a question?

13 MR. HUNTSMAN: Brent Huntsman,
14 Beavercreek. Part of the cost that you've
15 shown, does that include long term monitoring,
16 and if it does, how long?

17 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Yes, it
18 does. The EECA report anticipated that the
19 dual phase extraction would take 6 to 9 months
20 to meet the remediation goals on site, so the
21 long term O&M of the dual phase extraction
22 system was only calculated out to 9 months,
23 however there were costs that were included for
24 long term residential groundwater and through
25 five years and general monitoring of the site

1 over that period of time.

2 MR. HUNTSMAN: Would that be
3 quarterly monitoring?

4 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Well, I
5 believe what we were looking at was, while
6 quarterly monitoring for the first year and
7 then either annual or semi annual after that.
8 I think it gradually became less.

9 MS. BILL: Other questions?

10 MR. GLASER: Will any attempt be
11 made to involve the land owner and the cost of
12 cleaning up this particular site?

13 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: I'm going
14 to speak on behalf of U.S. EPA and Heather can
15 correct me if I'm wrong. I believe the
16 approach that's being taken is U.S. EPA doesn't
17 typically go after a property owner that was
18 not involved in the contamination, and this
19 particular property owner bought the site five
20 years after the fire.

21 But what they are going to do is
22 place a lien on the property so we don't spend
23 a million or so cleaning it up and then she can
24 sell it for a profit. If she did sell it, then
25 that money would go to help defray the clean-up

1 costs.

2 And I've also had discussions
3 with the property owner about potential for
4 donating it to some interested group whether it
5 be the Beaver Creek Wetlands or whoever might,
6 you know, neighborhood associate that might
7 want to do something with the property and that
8 way I think everybody would benefit. So those
9 are the options that are on the table right
10 now.

11 MS. SMITH: My question was,
12 there was some talk about possibly helping --
13 oh, I'm sorry. We were told that there's a
14 possibility that they might help those people
15 who didn't have their wells tested. We live on
16 Rosendale and our well was never tested for the
17 chemicals. Is that still a possibility that we
18 will be able to have at least partially some
19 help in paying for that test? We don't know if
20 our well is contaminated or not, it's quite
21 expensive.

22 MR. KESSLER: She's further
23 down.

24 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Okay. My
25 understanding is that you live further south on

1 Rosendale?

2 MS. SMITH: Well, it's just,
3 it's just right on Rockfield and Rosendale.

4 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: What we
5 have here, if you look at the figure, is based
6 on the sampling that we did. There's this
7 whole row of non-detects and basically what we
8 anticipate, and we haven't selected the 15 or
9 approximately 15 wells that we would be
10 sampling long term, is we would probably select
11 some along this row, and the goal would be to
12 monitor whether or not the flume is migrating.

13 So if you're not one of the
14 wells that's actually selected, there would be
15 a row before you that would detect whether the
16 flume is migrating in your direction or not.

17 We feel that we got a pretty
18 good handle on the southern component of the
19 flume and that it hasn't gone any further south
20 than this, so we would continue to monitor in
21 this area and that would kind of be your line
22 of protection because if you're further down
23 here, then the water, the contamination would
24 be detected here before it would get to you
25 (indicating).

1 MS. SMITH: Okay. Oh, my name
2 is Marsha Smith.

3 MS. BILL: Other questions?

4 MR. LINGG: My name is Timothy
5 Lingg, L-I-N-G-G. If I recall correctly, the
6 EECA analysis report says that there's PCBs and
7 lead in the surface soils and how will they be
8 taken care of?

9 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: The levels
10 of lead and PCBs that were actually detected in
11 the surface soils were below, they were in the
12 acceptable risk range. There are higher levels
13 at about 4 feet, but we feel that those are not
14 going to be, the people aren't going to be
15 coming into contact with those.

16 Those levels would have been
17 above the acceptable risk range but I believe
18 that the levels of lead and PCBs that were in
19 the 0 to 2 foot range were in the acceptable
20 risk level.

21 MR. LINGG: My recollection is
22 contrary to that but I don't have the report
23 here so I can't dispute you.

24 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: I do and we
25 can look that up. I know because I know we've

1 had discussions about that and whether or not
2 it needs to be addressed.

3 MR. LINGG: Okay. The other
4 question is the report that the, local analysis
5 that Ed Hess is responsible for; does that
6 substantiate or does that basically agree with
7 your analysis that was done by college and
8 environment?

9 I mean, that was a local, you
10 did a local sampling of wells, did you not,
11 or -- oh, you didn't do a comprehensive sample
12 as much as this?

13 MR. HESS: No.

14 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Yeah, the
15 wells that Ed and the Beaver Creek Environmental
16 Advisory Committee sampled are these ones that
17 are slashed in green here --

18 MR. LINGG: Oh, I see.

19 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: -- and
20 there was some other ones, I think, 1 or 2 more
21 you said that aren't on the paper?

22 MR. HESS: Two more that were
23 further to the east.

24 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: So
25 basically they didn't resample wells that we

1 had already sampled. They took that that data
2 was good and wanted to see if maybe if they
3 went further out that maybe the flume hadn't
4 been fully identified. So, I don't know, Ed,
5 if you want to add anything to that?

6 MR. HESS: That's correct.

7 MR. LINGG: Thank you.

8 MS. BILL: Did that fully answer
9 your question?

10 MR. LINGG: Yes, it did.

11 MR. DALLEY: Jim Dalley again of
12 Rexford Road. The, I'm trying to think of how
13 to phrase my question, sorry, but as the, more
14 of the houses who are on wells connect up,
15 will, do you anticipate that that might change
16 the pattern of the flume as they're no longer
17 pulling the water out of the aquifer there?

18 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Well,
19 that's a possibility. I would say just the 3
20 wells that we're hooking up aren't going to
21 have much of an impact at all. If the whole
22 area hooked up, you'd see it, and, in fact,
23 probably if half the area hooked up, you would
24 see an impact. And that, again, that's a
25 reason for the long term groundwater monitoring

1 is to keep an eye on any changing patterns that
2 might emerge from the contamination.

3 MR. DALLEY: If there were any
4 changes, if a lot of people hooked up, let's
5 say since you just mentioned that as a
6 scenario, do you have any guess as to what the
7 change in pattern could potentially be?

8 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: My guess
9 would be not much because the predominant
10 groundwater flow in the area is to the east. I
11 think, you know, and this is a hypothesis that
12 we have discussed, part of the reason that
13 we're seeing contamination down here now that
14 perhaps we didn't before is because this whole
15 row to the east of people stopped using their
16 wells and all of these people down here still
17 did, so we, you know, theorized that perhaps
18 that's why there's some southerly component.

19 If everybody hooked up or a lot
20 of people hooked up to the county water, you're
21 going to see the natural predominantly east
22 flow return.

23 MR. DALLEY: Let's see, that
24 brings up another question, rather a different
25 question, but you're speaking of the two routes

1 for bringing in water; it would appear that the
2 more expensive one would also be disruptive to
3 businesses and there would be some down sites
4 there; is there anyone who would benefit from
5 that that you can see, would it allow more
6 people to get on water, and have you had any
7 indication whether they would be interested in
8 that or is it just more expensive, more problem
9 to maintain and more disruptive to go loop
10 around the block? What would be the side
11 effects or have you looked into that?

12 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Well, one
13 of the reasons for not doing it that way,
14 besides it costing more -- excuse me, let me
15 back up. One of the reasons for not cutting
16 through the back way is the easements we talked
17 about. Those oftentimes can take a long period
18 of time to negotiate unfortunately, so that
19 could cause unnecessary delays.

20 You know, if we talk with the
21 county water department and U.S. EPA goes out
22 and approaches the people whose properties
23 they'll have to go through and it looks like it
24 could be an ugly, long, drawn out process, then
25 we may just say in the long run it could end up

1 costing less to go this way because of the time
2 spent on negotiating easements.

3 You know, I think, too, if we go
4 down this way it does go in front of more
5 peoples' homes so they would have more
6 opportunity to hook up if they so chose but
7 that's not the purpose for putting in the
8 county water line, it's to hook up the 3 wells
9 with excedences.

10 MR. LETT: Sherman Lett again.
11 If you clean the Lammars Barrel Works Factory
12 site up and you're talking about the flume
13 coming on southeast, if that's cleaned up, will
14 the contaminants still come down that way or is
15 it, will that take care of it?

16 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: If you
17 think back to what Ed was saying about the
18 flume is somewhat static, it looks like it kind
19 of goes out into this area here and then just
20 peters out.

21 If we remediate this source and
22 take away this source, you know, remove the
23 contaminated soils and the contaminated water
24 from the site, what we're anticipating is all
25 of this will dissipate over time. So, yes, we

1 do --

2 MR. LETT: That's fine. I've
3 got a good well and I'd hate to see it go.

4 MR. HAMLIN: My name is Jeff
5 Hamlin. I have a question for you regarding
6 the extension of the county water lines. Have
7 you or will you be discussing that with the
8 county because I understand their time table is
9 very long and it's a long drawn out process for
10 them to do that, and would the EPA make that an
11 emergency situation so the county can step up
12 their time table?

13 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Yeah, I
14 think what's anticipated is that's like going
15 to be the very first thing that the contractor
16 does once the funding becomes available is
17 contact the county water department and get
18 this moving.

19 I think a lot of times the
20 county goes according to funding, as they get
21 their funding they can do the work. If we say
22 here's the money, hopefully they can put it
23 right on their table of things to do.

24 MR. DUBRUIEL: This is Dan
25 Dubruiel, City Manager. We've been involved

1 with the county water officials now since last
2 summer on this project. They're well aware of
3 the interests and urgency, and typically they
4 do an expedited process with something of this
5 nature if the funding is available.

6 The only thing that might take
7 it a little bit longer is if they were doing a
8 special assessment. That's not the case here.
9 This is going to move ahead pretty quickly, I
10 think, as soon as it's available and they can
11 secure the necessary contracts.

12 MS. BILL: Other questions?

13 MR. LINGG: Timothy Lingg. Why
14 do the VOC concentrations vary so much? It's
15 43.3 parts per billion down to non-detect right
16 across the street; is this typical of sites
17 like this or is this -- can you explain it?

18 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Brent, you
19 want to explain it? Actually my experience
20 with groundwater contamination plumes is that
21 they do just die out at a certain point, and
22 part of the explanation here could be wells
23 that are streamed at different depths because
24 we, as Ed said, we don't have really good well
25 logs for all these wells so you may have a well

1 at a certain depth at one residence that has
2 some contamination, across the street their
3 well may be 20 feet deeper, 10 feet more
4 shallow and it's missing the contamination.
5 But we feel like we've got a pretty good
6 handle, like I said, on where the flume
7 boundaries are.

8 MR. LINGG: Thank you.

9 MS. BILL: Other questions?

10 MS. SMITH: Are you more likely
11 to have contamination if your well is shallow
12 or --

13 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: It depends
14 on how close to the site you are.

15 MS. SMITH: We're right on
16 Rockfield and Rosendale.

17 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Yeah, and
18 again we've sampled every well between you and
19 the site and found a number of wells here that
20 were non-detects and again we feel we've
21 delineate the flume.

22 MS. SMITH: So are you saying
23 then that our well is safe; is that what you're
24 saying basically?

25 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: I wouldn't

1 say that without seeing some data.

2 MS. SMITH: So we really don't
3 know if our well is safe, we don't really know
4 if we have pure drinking water?

5 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: I'm
6 comfortable that we have defined the flume from
7 the Lammars Barrel Factory.

8 MS. SMITH: I'm sorry?

9 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: I said I'm
10 comfortable that we have defined the flume
11 that's coming from the Lammars Barrel Factory
12 site.

13 MS. BILL: Ed or Dan, would
14 either of one of you like to make a comment
15 about what some of the costs were per well when
16 you did this latest sampling in case people
17 want to have their wells sampled? I'm sorry to
18 put you on the spot.

19 MR. DUBRUIEL: Well, we were
20 fortunate to have managed to obtain a very
21 reasonable cost to do the actual lab work
22 analysis based on the fact we were doing
23 several samples and then we had the benefit of
24 the county health department coming in and
25 doing the actual sampling themselves according

1 to the appropriate protocol and conveying those
2 samples to the lab for their analysis.

3 Normally it is fairly expensive
4 to have it done on a single basis and we were
5 fortunate to get all 15 samples done for about
6 a little over \$3,000, so it was a considerable
7 cost savings there.

8 My understanding is that you're
9 looking at a couple hundred dollars possibly to
10 have a sampling of this nature done on an
11 individual basis.

12 MS. BILL: Thanks. Other
13 questions?

14 MR. KELLEHER: Casey Kelleher.
15 On the dual phase extraction, which I believe
16 is expected to take 6 to 9 month, I have a few
17 questions about that; one is, is that going to
18 be, is all of the equipment involved in that
19 going to be fenced in a secure way? I imagine
20 you're not going to have somebody on site
21 monitoring that every 24 hours a day for 6 to 9
22 months.

23 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: No, the
24 intent is to have it fenced in, all the
25 equipment.

1 MR. KELLEHER: And how often
2 would that be monitored by a live human being,
3 I mean?

4 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Well, there
5 are a couple ways that it could be designed.
6 We could put in remote telemetry, that way
7 somebody could monitor it from a remote area.
8 The anticipation is to be out there fairly
9 frequently at first. I don't know.

10 MR. KELLEHER: Somebody's idea
11 of fairly frequently might be once a month,
12 somebody else's might be daily.

13 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: No, it
14 would probably be daily initially to make any
15 adjustments to the system that need to be done
16 and then that would taper off as we note that
17 things are working as they should be.

18 It hasn't been designed yet so
19 whether we would have any kind of remote
20 monitoring I don't know. And, you know, we'd
21 have to work with the contractors to make a
22 schedule for it and I will be right here in
23 town too so I can hopefully be out there as
24 often as possible.

25 And then, of course, there would

1 be regular monitoring of the systems. We'd
2 have to monitor if we have carbon filters for
3 the treatment, we'd have to monitor those
4 similar to point of entry filters in the home.
5 There would be monitoring of wells, so there
6 would be over site, wouldn't be somebody out
7 there all the time, but --

8 MR. KELLEHER: When you say
9 there would be monitoring of wells, do you mean
10 at the site or in, of the wells in the area
11 around it?

12 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: All of the
13 above. We would do on-site monitoring in order
14 to evaluate the effectiveness of the system and
15 there's also the proposed long term groundwater
16 monitoring of approximately 15 wells,
17 residential wells from up to five years past
18 the installation of the system.

19 MR. KELLEHER: Okay. I'm on
20 East Patterson, I'm the, I believe I'm the
21 122.40 at the top of the map there, so we can
22 expect and look forward to future visits for
23 sampling of our well?

24 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Well, that
25 has to be determined. We have to evaluate,

1 there will be a balance of wells that are
2 selected, one to evaluate -- we'll probably
3 want to pick some that have contamination, yes,
4 to evaluate whether or not the levels are
5 declining, but we'll also want to monitor out
6 along the edges of the flume to make sure that
7 it's not migrating at all, and that needs to be
8 looked at in the future, that will be part of
9 the design process and development of the long
10 monitoring plan.

11 MR. KELLEHER: Seeing it as we
12 went up the last time we were sampled, I, we
13 volunteer.

14 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Write his
15 name down.

16 MR. KELLEHER: Last question --
17 no, I've got two. There's a single pump sunk
18 in the ground at the site centrally located?

19 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: The way
20 it's proposed right now is that there will be
21 one on the south side and one on the north
22 side.

23 MR. KELLEHER: Of the creek?

24 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Of the
25 creek. And that may or may not change as we

1 get into the design and iron out the
2 specifics. It depends on how -- we're looking
3 at doing maybe a treatability study and looking
4 at how effective it is in that particular
5 location.

6 MR. KELLEHER: And this is my
7 last question, I think, is there no expectation
8 of any increase of contaminants either in the
9 air or in the creek itself as a result of this
10 process?

11 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Both the
12 discharges, the air discharge and the water
13 discharge would have to comply with permitting
14 levels so we have to work through the Ohio
15 EPA's permitting programs for air and water.

16 There might be minimal increase
17 over the 9 months or so, the approximate 9
18 month period, that this system is in operation,
19 but it would all be treated so it would be
20 minimal levels and it's an unavoidable result
21 of remediating the site.

22 MR. KELLEHER: Well, we don't
23 drink the creek, I imagine that the vinyl
24 chloride especially is so volatile that it's
25 going to be rapidly dispersed and really not

1 anything we need to be concerned about?

2 MS. GIBBONS BOHLER: Hopefully
3 we wouldn't be putting much of that at all into
4 the creek. It would all be captured in the
5 treatment systems as much as possible.

6 MR. KELLEHER: Thank you.

7 MS. BILL: Other questions?
8 Okay, I'd like to open this up to the formal
9 comment period. Like I mentioned before, this
10 is this an opportunity for you to make a
11 comment on any of the proposals that you've
12 heard or anything else.

13 We won't be responding to those
14 comments tonight but will be providing a
15 written response later on. And I also wanted
16 to mention to you and also to the people who
17 are watching this at home or will see this
18 later on video, you can comment in writing as
19 well.

20 In the Fact Sheet there's an
21 insert and you can provide written comments or
22 you can just send us a letter. My name is on
23 the Fact Sheet, and comments are due, of
24 course, I don't have it in front of me, by May
25 12th.

1 MR. KESSLER: Can you give the
2 address and e-mail so that people can send it
3 in?

4 MS. BILL: Sure. Comments
5 should go to me, my name is Bri Bill, that's
6 B-R-I, my last name is Bill, B-I-L-L. The
7 address is 77 West Jackson, and there's a mail
8 code, P, as in Paul, dash 19J, it's U.S. EPA,
9 Chicago, Illinois, 60604. My fax number is
10 (312)353-1155. And my e-mail address is Bill,
11 B-I-L-L, dot Briana, B-R-I-A-N-A, at EPA dot
12 GUV. I would imagine that perhaps our cable
13 station people will be putting that on the
14 video as well. Would anyone like to make a
15 comment? Okay. And just a reminder, everybody
16 state their name.

17 MR. KESSLER: Don Kessler
18 speaking for the CAG. I think, we've discussed
19 this before and I would just like to go on
20 record that we would like to proceed with the
21 dual phase extraction and the extension of the
22 county water lines at the earliest
23 possibility.

24 MS. BILL: Thank you. Other
25 comments? Okay. Looks like we ran out of

1 batteries on the mike so without further ado
2 due I'll end the meeting. Thank you very much
3 for coming.

4 (WHEREUPON, the Public Hearing
5 concluded at 8:10 p.m.)

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Kimberly A. Davis, a Court
Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
is a full, true and correct transcript of my
notes taken in the above-styled case and
thereafter transcribed by me.

Kimberly A. Davis
Court Reporter